Trans-Lake Washington Project
Washington State Department of Transportation
Sound Transit

MEETING SUMMARY

TRANS-LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND INDUSTRY, SEATTLE
OCTOBER 4, 2000 — 9:00 AM TO 5:00 PM

INTRODUCTION

Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, began the meeting with a review of the agenda. The goal for the day was to complete the first level screening. Discussion of the second level screening criteria was postponed, since the first level screening was anticipated to take the majority of the day. There were no other changes to the agenda.

UPDATE ON SEPTEMBER 27 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Pat Serie gate an update on the Executive Committee's decision to adopt the first level screening criteria at its September 27, 2000, meeting. She noted that all three committees struggled with including cost as a first level screening criterion, and that the Executive Committee concurred with the recommendation not to use it as a stand-alone criterion.

SCREENING PROCESS OVERVIEW

Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill, gave an overview of the process for conducting the screening. Each group of modal alternatives were to be considered separately. Each alternative would be described, and ratings would be discussed. She emphasized that the alternatives ratings would be compared relative to the other same-mode alternatives, e.g. highway-to-highway. Cross-modal comparisons, e.g. highway versus HCT, would not carry any meaning. Relative comparisons among the same modes will be significant. Visuals displaying GIS and potential alignment information overlaid on aerials were used to help explain the alternatives. The staff recommendations were made relative to other alternatives in the same mode.

It was noted that the number of alternatives that pass first level screening will affect the level of detail that can be determined in the second level. However, the recommendations should not be driven by cost. Rather they should represent a sufficient mix of choices.

DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVES

Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, described each of the alternatives. John Perlic, Parametrix, reviewed staff recommendations on effectiveness criteria, and Lorie Parker reviewed recommendations on environmental criteria. Discussion points emphasized and questions raised about each are noted below. Highway alternatives were discussed first. The assumption is made that additional lanes are added at grade, in horizontal directions. This does not preclude the possibility of looking at the alternatives in stacked or layered formats later. [References made to the ratings are indicated as fractions of black filled in: 'empty' = 1 , ¼ = 2 , ½ = 3 ; ¾ = 4 , 'full' = 5]

DISCUSSION OF HIGHWAY ALTERNATIVES

No action alternative

Only the floating portion of the bridge would be replaced, likely with a slightly wider corridor.

B1 – Minimum Footprint

Was not ranked in the first level screening, as it was accepted that it will receive additional scrutiny. Little improvement would be gained from an effectiveness standpoint. Does not really meet the purpose and need statement, though the Trans-Lake Study Committee recommended it for further study. The alternative would not increase impacts much, and would likely give an opportunity to fix some of the past impacts.

Effectiveness discussion:

- It should be more effective than an empty rating.
- Len Newstrum stated that the alternative on its own may not meet the purpose and need. A combination of minimum footprint and HCT, similar to an I-405 option, might be a viable way to make it work.

Environmental discussion:

- Environmental impacts rating should be less than ½.
- Jennifer Quan stated that this option rates the best environmentally, and would like to see the kinds of incentives to use bus or HOV lanes that are not being used.
- Terry Marpert stated that the minimum footprint idea could be carried through the other alternatives, as a way of reducing impervious surfaces.
- Jennifer Quan stated that B1 should be retained because of the environmental goals. She is not convinced that the options are fully fleshed out in D1, and would like to see the practicality of aggressive TDM in a minimum footprint. Decision makers will not want to choose the 'no action' alternative, but minimum footprint may be a viable option combined with TDM.

Recommendation:

The committee recommended that B1 be studied further with a 'yes' recommendation, noting that there were some reservations.

B2 – HOV lanes

Effectiveness discussion:

- Would I-5 HOV reversibility change the design on this alternative?
- Interchanges would be consistent with direct HOV access ramps.
- Vehicular traffic in the general purpose (GP) lanes would likely increase because of the shift of people and vehicles into the HOV lanes.
- Assumptions have not been made about the occupancy requirement for the HOV lanes.
- Significant improvement would be gained because it would make the HOV system continuous through the corridor, and from I-5 and I-405 on either end.
- There may be too many generalizations and assumptions about the subjective changes in social behavior. Figures would make it more concrete. Doug Schulz suggested that the words 'would carry' in the description should be changed to 'could carry.'
- Len Newstrum suggested lowering the effectiveness rating to ½ instead of ¾, because the westbound demand on the Eastside is not there.

- There was also strong support for leaving the rating ¾ in effectiveness.

Environmental discussion:

- This alternative rated a moderate environmental impact. There was one person who thought it should be rated to have a more significant environmental impact.

Recommendation:

The committee concurred with the 'yes' recommendation.

B3 – HOV and GP lanes

The GP lanes are assumed not to connect directly with I-5 and I-405, since this would necessitate a additional lane for 2 ½ miles north and southbound on each interstate. Connectivity is a huge issue with this alternative. GP lanes could potentially end at Montlake, or feed into the Mercer area on the Seattle side.

Effectiveness discussion:

- Impacts on arterials leading to and from the facility could be severe, and these should be reflected in both the system effectiveness and environmental impacts.
- It was suggested that the alternative be looked at in light of B7 – New freeway crossing. The discrepancy between rated effectiveness and potential effectiveness from a wider corridor-level view can be partly explained by the difference in the way it meets the purpose and need statement, and how modeling in the Trans-Lake Study did not show an appreciable decrease in demand.
- Jennifer Quan stated that from an environmental standpoint, the environmental impacts won't be able to be mitigated the way it currently reads. If stacking will be realistically considered with other aspects of creative design, then it would be more amenable. Doug Schulz suggested a 'no' recommendation for the alternative as written. Tunnels or a tiered structure would be better received.
- There may be ways to define it such that it would require certain characteristics to be carried forward, though this would define it in such a way that other alternatives have not yet been defined.
- Mitch Wasserman stated that he would find it difficult to embrace the alternative without a deeper understanding of what it involved.

Proposed changes:

A proposal was made to reduce the rating to ¾.

Environmental discussion:

- The alternative has high impacts because of width, length, and salmon-bearing streams encountered in Redmond. There are also increased air and noise impacts.
- The question was raised if it would be possible to capture the fact that a layered highway might significantly decrease environmental impacts. It was generally agreed that the strategy used to implement an 8-lane configuration would have a significant effect on the discussion and ratings.

Recommendation:

The committee recommended that the B3 alternative be carried forward with a 'yes' recommendation.

B4 – General purpose lanes

Effectiveness discussion:

- There were several comments that this would not be an effective solution to the problem.
- Mobility for freight would be improved in this case, a point that the Advisory Committee wanted to emphasize.
- Terry Marpert stated that this does not promote the purpose and need by itself. It would not help connect the HOV systems on either side of the lake. Susan Sanchez concurred with Terry's comments, and stated that the effectiveness rating should be decreased. There are also problems with the description of the measures.
- Mitch Wasserman noted that the value of evaluating GP lanes independently through second level screening would be for comparison to the performance of HOV lanes. There were several people who concurred with this.
- Jim Leonard, FHWA, stated that the Technical Committees' 'no' recommendation might be backed up enough by the work of the Trans-Lake Study Committee.
- An exclusion of B4 may call into question the adequacy of the alternatives analysis. Keeping B4 and B5 may be a way of anchoring the ends of the range of highway alternatives.
- There was general agreement that the effectiveness rating should be lowered from ½ to ¼.

Environmental discussion:

- Impacts are generally the same as for alternative B2, which assumes the same six-lane configuration.
- Increased queuing on arterial streets is not reflected in the rating.
- Jennifer Quan stated that the environmental impacts would be more significant than other six lane configurations because of the air quality impacts.

Recommendation:

The committee recommended passing B4 with a 'yes' recommendation, caveated by the fact that a number of them do not think it should be the ultimate solution.

B5 – Bus only lanes

Effectiveness discussion:

- This configuration assumes paint stripe separation for a bus and vanpool only lane.
- This alternative seems a lot like HCT, but impacts would be the same as HOV. Should it be considered as a BRT option?. The definition adopted for HCT is that it assumes a dedicated, barrier separated facility. The title for this alternative may be misleading.
- Weighting of the mobility criteria, as well as the definition and role of mobility, should be better addressed, and reflected in the rating.
- Compatibility with the other corridors is important, and the lack of a compatible system on either end may be a detriment.
- Buses and HCT offer a great amount of flexibility in meeting large amounts of unmet capacity demand. The reality is that even if the 520 bridge is built to a maximum footprint, there will still be a large unmet demand.
- Susan Sanchez stated that arterial street and interchange impacts will show the real difference between this and B2.

- Peter Dewey stated that B2, B5, and B6 are all part of the same options. Jeff Peacock supports keeping them independent, as it would not indicate an additional amount of work.
- Bernard van de Kamp stated that he would like to incorporate this as an option on B2.
- For I-405 compatibility, it might make sense to modify this to make it a combination BRT and HOT lane.
- There are 12 projects around the country that can be used as models for the various bus only / HOV restrictions. The 6+ restriction may not prove very helpful.
- The illustration should indicate a bus HOV lane all the way to I-405. Occupancy requirements and barriers should be clarified in the description.

Environmental discussion:

- This option implies the same impacts as the other six lane facilities.

Recommendation:

The committee recommended a 'yes' recommendation with a question mark about its merits, and the possibility of studying it as a B2 option.

B6 – HOV Tunnel

Effectiveness discussion:

- This alternative was suggested specifically in a scoping comment. An independent facility would operate in the same corridor as the existing bridge. The Discovery Institute also advocated looking at it. The existing bridge would undergo the same improvements as with the no action alternative.
- This may represent the only concept that inherently proposes mitigation as part of the design. The tunnel would be the least disruptive to the environment.
- The alternative is not yet specified to indicate whether bridge replacement would be included as part of the cost for consistency. Jeff Peacock stated that tunnels will be considered for all alternatives, if they prove feasible. This is separated because it was specifically indicated in a scoping comment. It is recommended to pass with a 'yes' in order to more fully study the implications.
- Mitch Wasserman stated that restricting such a tunnel to HOV use is short sighted. He wants to know that the tunnels will be given due consideration, and language should be added to the descriptions to ensure that.
- Doug Schulz pointed out that the B7 new freeway alternative received only a ½ rating for effectiveness. Why would tunnels not be considered for that option, if they are being considered for all others? Jeff Peacock stated that other environmental impacts in a new corridor and the constraints of I-5 and I-405 pose different issues.
- The language 'in this location' should be changed in the description to read 'in the same corridor.'

Environmental discussion:

- The definition is not clear enough to rate impacts. There will be impacts to fish, and portals will also be an issue.

- The tunnel would need to be a distance from the existing bridge, to allow for the anchor cables, unless it were placed directly beneath the existing bridge, in which case construction staging might be a problem.
- It was agreed to look at the technical feasibility of the tunnel by the time the Executive Committee meets on October 25, 2000, in order to provide appropriate information on the impacts and feasibility, short of rating it.

Recommendation:

The committee recommended that the B6 option receive a 'no' recommendation, noting that it would be considered as a part of B2.

B7 – New freeway and bridge

- A new crossing could be a bridge, a tunnel, or a tube, depending on the feasibility study. It is assumed that the land portion on the west side of the lake would be a tunnel, which differentiates it from the proposal looked at in the Trans-Lake Study.

Effectiveness discussion:

- A new north crossing was not supported by the origin-destination study in the Trans-Lake Study. The O-D study showed that congestion would not be relieved on 520.
- The alternative would not be serving the larger central areas, and would require substantial I-405 and I-5 improvements.
- Since this improves mobility across all the trans-lake systems as a whole, the effectiveness should be higher.
- Construction without a bridge closure would be a plus. Should be higher effectiveness since the other ratings are not considering effects during construction.
- Bernard van de Kamp stated that if it does not meet the purpose and need of the project, it should not move forward. The benefit might be found on 522 and I-90, but not likely on 520.

Environmental discussion:

- Environmental impacts would be substantial since it would involve entirely new areas. The impacts at shorelines would be of utmost consequence.

Recommendation:

The committee recommended that B7 receive a 'no' recommendation, with Doug Schulz, Medina, dissenting.

B8 – New arterial bridge

- There was general agreement with the low effectiveness and environmental ratings.

Recommendation:

The committee recommended that B8 receive a 'no' recommendation.

B9 – Close SR 520 interchanges between I-5 and I-405

Effectiveness discussion:

- Increases in congestion on local arterials and associated increases in travel time rated this alternative low, even though there would be an increase in corridor carrying capacity.
- Does the spacing or number of ramps at either end contribute to the problem?

- Controlling versus limiting access differentiates this option from a TDM option such as ramp metering.

Environmental discussion:

- Environmental effects might include congestion in neighborhoods and backups into new areas.

Recommendation:

The committee recommended that B9 receive a 'no' recommendation by itself, but that it should be looked at as a tool/TDM strategy in conjunction with other alternatives.

B10 – Modify HOV operations

Changes would be made to reduce HOV occupancy from 3+ to 2+ in the 520 corridor. It was specifically suggested in a scoping comment.

Effectiveness discussion:

- 100% occupancy rule is a good idea.
- This would be a good strategy in combination with others, but is difficult by itself to rate.
- This might be considered an operational decision change.
- The PSRC outlook for 20 years states that HOV 2+ will not have any benefit.
- Jeff Peacock suggested breaking the alternative in two: eliminate the reference to HOV 2+/3+ entirely, and recommend using 100% occupancy requirements as part of a TDM strategy.

Recommendation:

The committee recommended B10 receive a 'no' recommendation, and that further consideration of it be considered as part of a TDM strategy.

B11 – Convert SR 520 lanes

- No comments were made.

Recommendation:

The committee recommended that B11 receive a 'no' recommendation.

COMMENTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEE MEMBERS (EXECUTIVE AND ADVISORY)

Paul Demetriades, City of Medina, made the following points:

1. Since the Discovery Institute, he has been impressed by tunnels and engineering solutions. Both the Technical and Executive Committees ought to be briefed by James Felch and the Discovery Institute. Current cost estimates are twice as great as originally anticipated.
2. Add eastside neighborhoods as well as Fairweather Bay, Cozy Cove, and Yarrow Bay to all discussions of neighborhood impacts.
3. Add bald eagle territory to 'habitat' discussion.
4. Consider GMA and land-use criteria in all of these alternatives.
5. Regarding wetlands vegetation, the Points Communities are copying Seattle in their management and protection.

Kingsley Joneson, Portage Bay – Roanoke, stated that the B6 HOV tunnel alternative should not be carried forward.

Greg Hill, Seattle, stated that each category should have a rating next to it. He made the following points:

1. B2 HOV lanes will help the environment, but will also increase SOV traffic.
2. B3 GP and HOV lanes will decrease cut through traffic, but will increase traffic volumes.
3. B4 GP lanes may not yield lower congestion levels.
4. B5 Bus only lanes will carry lower vehicular capacity relative to HOV lanes, but if person throughput is the criterion, then it should be measured relative to that.

Aubrey Davis, Transportation Commission, stated that discussion of changing HOV operations is inappropriate, since these are recommendations made by local committees to the state. HOV indicates that it carries busses, vanpools and cars. Aubrey also stated that he hoped to carry forward a tunnel of some kind, because it was placed on the table fairly and costs may be different than what they were two years ago, even though costs in this country may be different from others.

Jean Leed, Montlake, stated that there were two issues of particular concern. She is relieved that TDM alternative B9 might not be carried forward separately. She challenged the recommendation on B4 – GP lanes, stating that it would increase vehicles and reduce person capacity. The environmental rating on B9 is lower than it should be. She encourages further study of restricting access to the bridge portion of 520 to HOV vehicles at certain points, especially if the HOV lanes are carried forward.

Paul Carr, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, stated that air quality implications will come up later.

Connie Marshall, City of Bellevue, stated that the wording in B3 – GP and HOV lanes reflects old regional plans which anticipated an increase in regional capacity. That is no longer the case. 520 crosses ESA streams in West Lake Sammamish, and more drivers go through Bellevue and Seattle to get to I-5. She stated that B4 should be looked at in isolation, in order to gauge the effect of GP only versus HOV only additional lanes. The tunnel alternative should include at least one lane of GP. HCT lanes should also be considered

Elizabeth Newstrum, Town of Yarrow Point, stated that compatibility with the other freeways will be very important, and she proposed to have time scheduled to coordinate with the other projects on the technical teams.

Jim McIsaac, Eastside Transportation Commission, stated that the interchange issues will not prevent the bottleneck, but that the capacity across the water will need to be increased at either end.

Eugene Wasserman, Neighborhood Business Council, noted that the upcoming election could potentially have an impact on the course of the project.

HCT ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSION

Jim Parsons, Puget Sound Transit Consultants, led the discussion of HCT alternatives. Jim stated that there is no network of existing transit routes, and that some assumptions must therefore be made. The Sound Transit Long Range Vision is based on a HCT crossing in the I-90 corridor, and it is assumed that primary destinations on the Eastside would be served by a network extending from either the I-90 or 520 trans-lake crossing. The western end of the crossing would tie into the north-south line and downtown Seattle, as well as a potential east-west line to Ballard.

C1 – High Capacity Transit in the SR-520 corridor

Effectiveness:

- Have the possibilities been considered in light of the I-405 options? Would 520 require widening out to Redmond, or would it be sufficient to widen until I-405? Jim Parsons suggested that it may be better to avoid complicating the alternative with decisions which haven not been made.
- There were no objections raised to the ratings.

Recommendation:

The committee concurred with the 'yes' recommendation to pass this forward to the next level.

C2 – High Capacity Transit in the I-90 corridor

Effectiveness generally rates the same as with C1, with differences in configurations. There might also be slightly smaller markets for the ridership, since 520 serves Redmond and UW more directly. Compatibility rates higher since this alternative is in line with Sound Transit's Long Range Vision.

Effectiveness:

- The text describing 'existing and/or possibly modified or expanded roadway' on I-90 will have an effect on the rest of the system. That should be captured in the write-up.
- There is no reference to adding to mobility in the 520 corridor; this should also be captured.
- The I-90 study may result in 2-way transit, although it may not end up being an exclusive ROW.
- The terms and terminology for high-capacity transit (HCT) and bus rapid transit (BRT) need to be clearly defined. Jeff Peacock stated that HCT is defined as a system with a separated guideway, which could include BRT.

Environmental:

- This would likely have the fewest changes on I-90, and therefore the fewest environmental effects. This will not be fully known, however, until routes are chosen.
- Environmental impacts may differ with different technologies.
- There were also concerns raised about passing alternatives with higher environmental impacts, and weighting the effectiveness criteria higher in that regard.

[The staff recommendation is supposed to be ½ on environmental impacts, not ¾ as originally printed in the draft.]

Recommendation:

The committee concurred with the 'yes' recommendation for alternative C2. There are some concerns about offsetting current capacity on the bridge. Impacts are caveated better in the text than in the ratings, and impressions of impacts will change as more information becomes available.

C3 – High Capacity Transit in a Mid-Lake Corridor

Effectiveness:

- Since there are no data provided about the alignment and connections, it will only be accepted on faith that it can be worked out.
- Ties into other systems will require a common link and/or transfer facilities.
- Cooperation between the Trans-Lake Project and the I-405 Corridor study may provide more insight into how it would look.

- Staff believes this is worthy for further consideration because of the high ridership potential and shorter travel time by connecting downtown Seattle directly with downtown Bellevue.
- If new highway bridges are not being considered, then why should new HCT crossings? This alternative doesn't really fall into the realm of realistic possibilities.

Environmental:

- Such a route would imply all new impacts, but more information will not be known until some design options were laid out. Environmental impacts could be very severe, especially on the shoreline.
- The alternative could be developed to the level of those evaluated in the Trans-Lake Study Committee, which would indicate alignment, stations, and ridership. This would be less work than taking it all the way through second level screening, but would give enough information to realistically evaluate it. It will be important to know what the relative costs of a shared versus an independent facility would be.

Recommendation:

The committee initially split on the 'yes' / 'no' recommendation for C3 to receive further attention. The committee finally recommended that the alternative pass with a 'yes' recommendation.

C4 – High Capacity Transit in a North-Lake corridor

C4.1 – Sand Point to Kirkland

Effectiveness:

- This would require a lengthy extension to the University District.
- Ridership potentials may not be as high as with direct connections between urban centers, but that doesn't preclude its usefulness. Trans-Lake Study data showed it would obtain slightly less than half the ridership on either 520 or I-90. Peak hour mode distribution is higher than the daily ridership given in the Trans-Lake Study data.
- C4.1 and C4.2 are not as promising as C1, C2, and C3 because the residential and employment densities are not served, and getting to those areas is a little more circuitous.

Environmental:

- Environmental effects may be less in this area, as compared to the mid-lake crossing.

Recommendation:

The committee concurred with the 'no' recommendation on C4.1.

C4.2 Madison to Kirkland

Effectiveness:

- Slightly more effective than the Sand Point – Kirkland route, since it would more directly reach downtown Seattle.

Environmental:

- Environmental effects would be worse because it is a much longer route. Tunnels would require portals and vents.

Recommendation:

The committee concurred with the 'no' recommendation on C4.2.

COMMENTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEE MEMBERS (EXECUTIVE AND ADVISORY)

Aubrey Davis challenged the effectiveness ratings of C2 – HCT in the I-90 corridor, especially if only HCT ran on the middle lanes. He would lower the rating to ½.

Greg Hill stated in agreement that 520 serves a higher density of people and job centers, but that I-90 has a greater catchment area, and therefore would be more ideal. He does not see how C3 – Mid-lake crossing would be a good option considering that it only now conceptually would connect the two sides of the lake. C4.1 would have a shorter crossing, serve more neighborhoods without negatively impacting as many, and should therefore be rated higher than C3. Since the highway options being considered are fairly liberal in terms of which are being passed to second level screening, there should be the same liberalness with the HCT alternatives.

Connie Marshall stated that the HCT options may enable a large redeployment of busses that currently serve the Seattle – Bellevue route, to enable connections with other planned facilities. The shortest distance crossing will likely be the most cost effective. The I-90 center lanes will likely stay in the current reversible alignment, in case Sound Transit / Trans-Lake Project identify I-90 as the HCT corridor. There could be a B3a option, that made 4 HOV lanes instead of 2 GP and 2 HOV. Two of the lanes could be HOT lanes, as a means of raising revenue.

Jim MacIsaac stated that a local traffic alternative for cross-lake traffic could be beneficial. A good explanation of the differences between HCT technologies, including the need for exclusive guideways, is also needed. There will also be an added right of way for HCT, wherever the alignment is chosen.

David Asher, Kirkland, stated that Kirkland does not support any new north-lake crossing.

TDM ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSION

D1 – Increase effectiveness / investment in TDM

Jeff Peacock suggested that all alternatives laid out in D1 be carried forward, and not be reviewed as separate recommendations.

Comments:

- HOT lanes should be included.
- TDM and TSM should both be explicitly included.
- Measures should be applied to all multi-modal alternatives, but not necessarily the same package to all.
- Is there a way to look at effectiveness and cost on an item-by-item basis?
- Is it a general feeling that these would be ineffective as stand-alone alternatives?
- Early actions can also be looked at to see what was effective and ineffective. This list can be modified.
- All the Trans-Lake Study recommendations would fall short of capacity demand, and that implicates an aggressive focus on TDM.

Recommendation:

The committee recommended that D1 pass forward as an alternative with a 'yes' recommendation, with an explanation of how these tools will be applied later to multi-modal alternatives.

E1 – Passenger Ferry

Sound Transit did ask for additional study of the ferry proposals this year, and it will be looked at it again. Jeff Peacock recommended that Trans-Lake not move forward with it, as Sound Transit will be looking at it further.

Comments:

- Transit modeling used for the ferries could serve as a good connection with the University station, and be a non-conflicting addition.
- Declining to pass it in Trans-Lake does not mean it does not have merit.
- It doesn't do much to improve regional mobility.

Recommendation:

The committee concurred with the 'no' recommendation.

E2 – Other: Suburban Arterials

Jeff Peacock recommended that this not be considered further separately, but be considered as complements to improvements on 520.

Recommendation:

The committee concurred with the 'no' recommendation on E2.

CHANGES RECOMMENDED FOR THE DEFINITION OF ALTERNATIVES DOCUMENT

John Perlic stated that 'cut-through' is used to describe local access on smaller arterials, and does not refer to use of major arterials. This will be clarified in the next draft.

Different symbols should delineate the highway, HCT, and TDM alternatives when showing the ratings, to indicate that they were not rated relative to each other.

WRAP UP

Lorie Parker stated that edits which come out of this discussion will be presented to the Advisory Committee on October 11, and then again to the Technical Committee on October 25, before presentation to the Executive Committee later that day.

The first level screening criteria changes were minor, and were well received by the Executive Committee on September 27. Second level screening criteria will be brought up for discussion at the October 25 Technical Committee meeting. Any suggested changes should be brought to the attention of the team before October 25.

Lorie reminded the team that there are two parts to the second level screening – the modal and multi-modal, and that there were suggestions that some of the performance measures should be different. The screening process and criteria memo was revised to reflect these changes. Concerns should be discussed with John Perlic, Parametrix.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE, ACTION ITEMS

Pat Serie reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule for all three committees. The tour of the wetlands and nature preserves has been postponed.

MEETING HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- Preliminary Definition of Alternatives for First Level Screening, September 28, 2000, v1

- First Level Screening Evaluation Results – Technical Steering Committee Working Draft, September 28, 2000, PMX 2-R-v1
- Summary of First Level Evaluation and Screening, PMX 2-R-vi
- Technical Memo, Alternatives Proposed for First Level Screening (Working Draft), September 27, 2000, PMX-05-2000
- Technical Memo – Alternatives Analysis – Draft Screening Process and Criteria, September 20, 2000
- Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Summary Report, September 19, 2000
- Trans-Lake Washington Project Development Value Analysis
- Proposed 2001 Trans-Lake Washington Project committee Schedule – Draft, September 26, 2000
- Meeting Schedule

MEETING ATTENDEES

Committee Members

Present	Name		Organization
X	Arndt	Jim	City of Kirkland
X	Billen	Don	Sound Transit
X	Bowman	Jennifer	Federal Transit Administration
	Brooks	Allyson	Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
	Conrad	Richard	City of Mercer Island
	Cushman	King	Puget Sound Regional Council
X			(Pete Beaulieu)
X	Dewey	Peter	University of Washington
	Fisher	Larry	Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
X	Francis	Roy	King County Department of Transportation
	Gibbons	Tom	National Marine Fisheries Service
	Kennedy	Jack	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
	Kenny	Ann	Washington Department of Ecology
	Kircher	Dave	Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
X	Leonard	Jim	Federal Highway Administration
X	Marpert	Terry	City of Redmond
X	Newstrum	Len	Town of Yarrow Point
X	Pratt	Austin	U.S. Coast Guard, 13th District
	Rave	Krista	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
X	Sanchez	Susan	City of Seattle
X	Schulze	Doug	City of Medina
	Sparrman	Goran	City of Bellevue
X			(Bernard van de Kamp)
X	Sullivan	Maureen	WSDOT – NW Region
	Teachout	Emily	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
X			(Jennifer Quan)
X	Wasserman	Mitch	City of Clyde Hill
X	Willis	Joe	Town of Hunts Point

Other attendees:

Elizabeth Newstrum, Yarrow Point
Paul Carr, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
Bryan Cairns, Mercer Island
Connie Marshall, City of Bellevue
Gregory Hill, Seattle
Cheryl Pflug, Washington Legislature
Paul Demetriades, City of Medina
Jean Leed, Montlake Community Club
Jim MacIsaac, Eastside Transportation Commission
Ed Switaj, City of Seattle
Chris Johnson, King County Council
Clarissa Easton, Montlake Community Club
Kingsley Joneson, Portage Bay – Roanoake
Aubrey Davis, Washington Transportation Commission
Jeanne Berry, Town of Yarrow Point
Eugene Wasserman, Neighborhood Business Council
Rich White, iPolitics.com
Peter Hurley

Project Team

Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit
Rob Fellows, WSDOT
Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill
Pat Serie, EnviroIssues
Jeff Peacock, Parametrix
John Perlic, Parametrix
Jim Parsons, Puget Sound Transit Consultants
Daryl Wendle, Parametrix
Anne Sienko, CH2M Hill
Amy Grotefendt, EnviroIssues
Kimberly Farley, WSDOT OUM
Cathy Strombom, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Paul Hezel, EnviroIssues

PJH